1	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California
2	ROBERT McKIM BELL,
3	Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice
4	300 South Spring Street, Suite 5212 Los Angeles, California 90013-1204
5	Telephone: (213) 897-2556
6	Attorneys for Complainant
7	BEFORE THE
8	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:) NO. D-5408
12	THOMAS M. BROD, M.D. OAH No. L-61681
13	12304 Santa Monica Boulevard Suite 210 STIPULATED SETTLEMENT
14	Los Angeles, California 90025 AND DISCIPLINARY ORDER
15	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No.) G-20595,)
16	Respondent.
17	<u> </u>
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the
19	parties to the above-entitled proceedings that the following matters are true:
20	1. An Accusation in case number D-5408 was filed with the Division of
21	Medical Quality, of the Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs
22	(the "Division") on September 15, 1993, and is currently pending against Thomas M.
23	Brod, M.D. (the "respondent").
24	2. The Accusation, together with all statutorily required documents, was duly
25	served on the respondent on or about September 15, 1993, and respondent filed his
26	Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation on or about September 23, 1993.
27	3. The Complainant, Dixon Arnett, is the Executive Director of the Medical

Board of California and brought this action solely in his official capacity. The Complainant is represented by the Attorney General of California, Daniel E. Lungren, by and through Deputy Attorney General Robert McKim Bell.

- 4. The respondent is represented in this matter by Peter R. Osinoff, Esq., Bonne, Bridges, Mueller, O'Keefe & Nichols, 3699 Wilshire Boulevard, 10th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90010-2719.
- 5. The respondent and his attorney have fully discussed the charges contained in Accusation number D-5408, and the respondent has been fully advised regarding his legal rights and the effects of this stipulation.
- 6. At all times relevant herein, respondent has been licensed by the Medical Board of California under Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G-20595.
- Accusation and that, if proven at hearing, the charges and allegations would constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate.

 Respondent is fully aware of his right to a hearing on the charges contained in the Accusation, his right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against him, his right to the use of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents in both defense and mitigation of the charges, his right to reconsideration, appeal and any and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws. Respondent knowingly, voluntarily and irrevocably waives and give up each of these rights.
- 8. Respondent hereby withdraws his Notice of Defense and pleads <u>nolo</u> <u>contendere</u>, or no contest, to a charge of repeated negligent acts in violation of Business and Professions Code section 2234(c), the basis of which is as follows:
 - A. On or about July 5, 1985, respondent undertook the care of an adult female psychiatric patient, "V.T.", who suffered from the traumatic effects of early childhood sexual and physical abuse. Respondent met with "V.T." in

individual psychotherapy sessions for approximately four years until on or about April 8, 1989.

- B. In the course of said relationship, respondent failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.
- C. The patient initially was referred to Dr. Brod for a problem with urinary retention and undertook biofeedback therapy for that problem. In or about February 1986, the patient's urinary retention problem improved and she ceased further biofeedback therapy but continued with psychotherapy. Shortly after the commencement of treatment, respondent formed the impression that the patient suffered from major depression.
- D. Respondent developed certain pictures and writings of the patient into a profile of his therapy with "V.T.", entitled "Structured Imagery in the Initiation of Psychotherapy: A Case Study," which he presented at two professional meetings.
- E. In or about August 1986, the patient was notified of a potentially large inheritance stemming from relatives in Switzerland. The patient told Dr. Brod of the inheritance.
- F. The patient told Dr. Brod that she would need to travel to Switzerland to take care of matters involving her inheritance. Dr. Brod agreed to accompany his patient to Switzerland but required that the patient write a letter stating her need to have him along on the trip. Respondent also brought his wife.
- G. Dr. Brod purchased airline tickets for himself, his wife and the patient, for which he was repaid by the patient. The three traveled together to Europe visiting Amsterdam and Zurich. They left together on September 14, 1986 and the patient returned alone on September 21, 1986. Dr. Brod and his wife returned two days later. Upon the advice of Dr. Brod, the patient

substituted a person known to Dr. Brod for the attorney handling her inheritance.

- H. The respondent traveled to Europe with his patient, despite being advised about the potential negative consequences of doing so by Dr. J. G., M.D., his personal psychoanalyst, and by Dr. K. M., M.D., who was his consultant.
- I. In Europe, the respondent, his wife and the patient engaged in personal encounters likely to be misinterpreted and confusing to his client, including taking meals together in restaurants at which alcohol was consumed, by staying at the same hotel, by celebrating the patient's birthday with a festive dinner, by visiting museums, taking snapshots together, and by advancing her money for the purchase of a coo-coo clock. In addition, the respondent permitted the patient to buy his wife a gift, a handbag, and used the occasion to deliver a professional paper in Amsterdam on an unrelated subject.
- J. Upon returning to California, Dr. Brod presented the patient with a bill for the cost of the trip, including airline and hotel costs for the time when all three were in Europe.
- K. Scheduled therapy sessions increased to five times a week, ordinarily as the last appointment of the day.
- L. In April 1989, the patient was at Dr. Brod's office for a professional visit. Dr. Brod asked the patient to remain in his outer waiting room while he typed a letter. When the respondent finished with his letter, he accompanied the patient to his car, purportedly to take her to her bus stop. Instead of taking her there, respondent drove the patient to Santa Monica-West Mental Health Center. Upon arrival, she was apprehended by a guard and restrained with handcuffs. The respondent told the personnel of the facility that the patient appeared to be homicidal and suicidal. He gave the staff officer of

the day a letter and directed that the patient be held involuntarily pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 5150.

- M. In the course of therapy with "V.T.," respondent developed a substantial personal relationship with the patient.
- N. He corresponded directly with her attorney in Europe inquiring about her inheritance.
- O. He did not maintain a clear and objective perspective in conducting psychotherapy with the patient.
- P. He did not contemporaneously prepare adequate clinical notes incident to treatment sessions with the patient and failed to make contemporaneous written notation of all prescription and non-prescription medications provided or prescribed to his patient, which included antidepressant medications, Atarax, Buspar, propanol, tegretol, meclizine, klonopin, amino acids and Vitamin B-6.
- Q. Over the period of August 1985 to April 1989 respondent provided his patient with gifts, including flowers on her birthday, a lap harp, two posters of artwork by Georgia O'Keefe, a tape of Indian sitar music, and concert tickets.
- R. In addition, respondent gave his patient car rides to her home or to the bus stop, visited the patient's home, made contact with her daughter, and provided her with the gift of an audiotape, sent cards marking special occasions, telephoned the patient and visited the Los Angeles County Art Museum to see an exhibit on German Expressionist art.
- S. On one occasion, in session, the respondent struck the patient twice on her knees.
- 9. The remaining charges in the Accusation are hereby dismissed.
- 10. The parties agree that this stipulation shall resolve all claims that the Board may have against Respondent related to or arising out of his care and treatment

11. Respondent is aware that, in any petition he may file for reinstatment or modification of penalty pursuant to Government Code section 11522 or Business and Professions Code section 2307, or in any other proceeding before the Medical Board of California, the Board may, can and will consider as true and established that respondent violated section 2234(c) in the manner set forth in paragraph 8.

- 12. The statements made by respondent herein are for the purpose of this proceeding and any other proceedings in which the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California, or other California governmental professional licensing agency is involved, and shall not be used as an admission in any other civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding, including but not limited to hospital staff privilege reviews.
- 13. Respondent agrees that the Division of Medical Quality may impose discipline upon his physician's and surgeon's certificate in the manner set forth below.

CIRCUMSTANCES IN MITIGATION

- 14. Respondent has never been disciplined by the Medical Board of California, or by any other state or local agency, hospital, professional society, or other professional organization.
- 15. Respondent obtained consultation and personal psychotherapy regarding difficulties he encountered in the treatment of "V.T."
- 16. Subsequent to "V.T.'s" treatment, respondent took more than 80 hours of continuing medical education on the topic of treatment of childhood sexual trauma, among more than 700 hours of continuing medical education courses taken by him during the past seven years.
- 17. Respondent has been active throughout his career in community service, most notably this year in organizing mental health support for victims of the Northridge earthquake, and in volunteer treatment of AIDS patients.

18. Based on the foregoing stipulated matters and circumstances in mitigation, the parties agree that the Division shall, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following order:

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate number G-20595 issued to Thomas M. Brod, M.D. is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for two years on the following terms and conditions:

- 1. EDUCATION COURSE Within ninety (90) days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division or its designee for its prior approval an educational program or course to be designated by the Division or its designee in the field of dual relationships, transference and/or boundary issues -- and to the extent that courses are not reasonably available within 150 miles of the respondent's address of record -- in the field of clinical psychiatry. Such continuing education shall not be less than 40 hours per year, for each year of probation and shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each course, the Division or its designee may administer an examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course. Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for 65 hours of continuing medical education of which 40 hours were in satisfaction of this condition and were approved in advance by the Division or its designee.
- 2. <u>ETHICS</u> Within 60 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division, or its designee, for its prior approval a course in Ethics, which respondent shall successfully complete during the first year of probation.
- 3. <u>DUAL OR SECONDARY RELATIONSHIPS PROHIBITED</u> Respondent is prohibited from engaging in any type of dual or secondary relationship with a patient,

or with any person related to or associated with a patient to the degree that the respondent's primary professional relationship with a patient is affected or compromised. For the purposes of this order, a dual or secondary relationship exists when the psychiatrist maintains or enters into a social, commercial, financial, or other relationship with his patient, which the psychiatrist knows, or reasonably should know, would affect his ability to render professional services to the patient in a completely objective and independent manner. Such prohibited dual or secondary relationships shall include but are not limited to the following:

- A. A business relationship either with the patient or anyone who is related to or associated with the patient to the degree that the licensee's primary professional relationship with the patient is affected or compromised by the potential for any personal, professional or financial gain or loss by the licensee.
- B. A romantic, physically intimate or sexual relationship with the patient or with anyone who is related to or associated with the patient to the degree that the licensee's primary professional relationship with the patient is affected or compromised.
- C. A barter of goods, property or services of any kind in exchange for the performance of professional services.
- D. A personal relationship wherein the psychiatrist knows, or reasonably should know, that the intent of the licensee or the patient is to expand the professional relationship into an individual, social relationship. Examples of such prohibited personal relationships include but are not limited to borrowing or lending money, giving or receiving gifts, bartering a service or product as payment for therapy, disclosure of current personal stresses by the therapist, employing a patient, transporting a patient, dining with a patient, or inviting a patient to a party or social event.

Prohibited dual or secondary relationships shall not include superficial social

encounters which cannot be predicted or avoided; however, the licensee shall have a duty to minimize such social encounters and shall under no circumstance create situations under which a patient may feel an obligation to engage in social activities with the licensee.

- 4. PRESCRIPTION DRUGS MAINTAIN RECORD Respondent shall maintain a record of all prescription medications prescribed, dispensed or administered by respondent during probation, showing all the following: 1) the name and address of the patient, 2) the date, 3) the character and quantity of medication involved, and 4) the indications and diagnosis for which the medication was furnished. Respondent shall keep these records in a separate file or ledger, or on duplicate prescription pads, in chronological order, and shall make them available for inspection and copying by the Division or its designee, upon request.
- 5. COST RECOVERY Respondent shall pay directly to the Division a liquidated sum in partial repayment of the board's costs of the investigation and prosecution of the case. That sum is determined to be \$5,000.00, and shall be paid in full within 24 months of the effective date of this decision. Cost recovery will not be tolled.
- 6. <u>OBEY ALL LAWS</u> Respondent shall obey all federal, state, and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.
- 7. QUARTERLY REPORTS Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.
- 8. <u>SURVEILLANCE PROGRAM</u> Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.
- 9. <u>INTERVIEW WITH MEDICAL CONSULTANT OR DESIGNEE</u> Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant or its designee upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

- 10. TOLLING FOR OUT-OF-STATE PRACTICE OR RESIDENCE The period of probation shall not run during the time respondent is residing or practicing outside the jurisdiction of California. If, during probation, respondent moves out of the jurisdiction of California to reside or practice elsewhere, whether temporarily or permanently, respondent is required to immediately notify the Division in writing within ten (10) days of the date of departure, and the date of return, if any.
- 11. <u>COMPLETION OF PROBATION</u> Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored to good standing.
- 12. <u>VIOLATION OF PROBATION</u> If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final. No petition for modification or termination of probation shall be considered while there is an accusation or petition to revoke probation pending against respondent.

CONTINGENCY

This stipulation shall be subject to the approval of the Division. If the Division fails to adopt this stipulation as its Order, the stipulation shall be of no force or effect, and shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties.

10.

ACCEPTANCE

I have read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I have fully discussed the terms and conditions and other matters contained therein with my attorney, Peter R. Osinoff. I understand the effect this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate, and agree to be bound thereby. I enter this stipulation freely, knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily.

DATED: November 22, 1994.

I have read the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order and approve of it as to form and content. I have fully discussed the terms and conditions

DATED: November 22, 1994.

and other matters therein with respondent Thomas M. Brod, M.D..

BONNE, BRIDGES, MUELLER, O'KEEFE &

NICHOLS

Respondent

By PETER R. OSINOFF Attorneys for Respondent

2 The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully submitted for the consideration of the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of 3 California Department of Consumer Affairs. 4 5 DATED: November 22, 1994. 6 DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California 7 8 ROBERT McKIM BELL 9 Deputy Attorney General 10 Attorneys for Complainant 11 12 DECISION AND ORDER 13 OF THE 14 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 15 16 The foregoing Stipulation and Order, in case number D-5408, is hereby adopted 17 as the Order of the Division of Medical Quality, Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs. An effective date of February 3, 1995, has been 18 assigned to this Decision and Order. 19 20 Made this 4th day of January , 1995. 21 22 FOR THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 23 24 25

ENDORSEMENT

1

26

1 2 3	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California Jaime R. Román, Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justice 300 S. Spring St., 10th Floor-North Los Angeles CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2581
5	Attorneys for Complainant
6	
7	
8	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA
9	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
	To the Wetter of the Assumption
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) Against:) CASE No. D-5408
12	THOMAS M. BROD, M.D.
13	12304 Santa Monica Blvd., #210) A C C U S A T I O N West Los Angeles, CA 90025)
14	Physician and Surgeon)
15	Certificate No. G-20595,)
16	Respondent.)
17	The Complainant alleges that:
18	PARTIES
19	1. Complainant is Dixon Arnett, Executive Director of
20	the Medical Board of California (hereinafter referred to as "the
.21-	Board"), and he brings this Accusation solely in his official
22	capacity.
23	2. On or about June 28, 1971, Physician's & Surgeon's
24	
25	Certificate No. G-20595 was issued by the Board to Thomas M.
26	Brod, M.D., (hereinafter "respondent") and at all times herein
27	mentioned, said license has been in full force and effect.

JURISDICTION

- 3. This Accusation is brought under the authority of the following sections of the California Business & Professions Code (hereinafter referred to as "the Code"):
- 4. Section 2220 of the Code provides the Division of Medical Quality, a division of the Board, may take action against all persons guilty of violating the Medical Practice Act.
- 5. Section 2227 of the Code provides that the Board may revoke, suspend for a period not to exceed one year, or place on probation, the license of any licensee who has been found quilty under the Medical Practice Act.
- 6. Section 2234 of the Code provides that the Division shall take action against any licensee charged with unprofessional conduct. Unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of this chapter.
 - (b) Gross negligence.
 - (c) Repeated negligent acts.
 - (d) Incompetence.

] 4

- (e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
- (f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate."

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 8. Section 51002(a) of the California Welfare and Institutions Code provides that a provider of service under the Medi-Cal program shall not submit claims to or demand or otherwise collect reimbursement from a Medi-Cal beneficiary, or from other persons on behalf of the beneficiary, for any service included in the Medi-Cal program's scope of benefits in addition to a claim submitted to the Medi-Cal program for that service, except to:
 - (a) Collect payments due under a contractual or legal entitlement pursuant to Section 14000(b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code,
 - (b) Bill a long-term care patient for the amount of his liability,
 - (c) Collect copayment pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 14134.
- 9. Section 51481 of Title 22 of the California Code of Administrative Regulations provides that no provider shall engage in conduct inimical to the public health, morals, welfare and safety of any Medi-Cal beneficiary.
 - 10. Section 51478 of Title 22 of the California Code

7

9

10 11

13 14

12

15

17 18

16

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27

of Administrative Regulations provides that no provider shall solicit, request, accept, or receive, any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage dividend, discount, or any other gratuitous consideration, in connection with the rendering of health care service to any Medi-Cal beneficiary.

- Section 51452(a) of Title 22 of the California 11. Code of Administrative Regulations provides that violation of any Medi-Cal statute, rule or regulation relating to the provision of health care services under the California Medical Assistance Program by an individual shall be deemed contrary to the public health, safety, welfare, morals, and to said program.
- Section 2263 of the Code provides that the 12. willful, unauthorized vioation of professional confidence constitutes unprofessional conduct.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under 13. section 726 of the Code in that he engaged in that he has committed and attempted to commit multiple acts of sexual abuse, misconduct, or relations with patient V.T. (hereinafter "patient"). The facts and circumstances are as follows:
 - On or about July 5, 1985, patient consulted the respondent, a psychiatrist, for persistent urinary retention.
 - In or about August 1985, respondent undertook biofeedback therapy with patient for her urinary In or about February 1986, patient's problem. urinary retention problem had improved and she ceased

27

further biofeedback therapy.

- (1) During this period of biofeedback therapy, patient and respondent discussed various mutual interests.
- (2) During this period of biofeedback therapy, respondent commented to patient that "women would kill to have a body that looked as good as hers."
- (3) In or about February 1986, when patient told respondent of her desire to cease further biofeedback therapy, respondent replied that:
 - (a) patient should continue therapy with him,
 - (b) he thought he was falling in love with
 her,
 - (c) he wanted a relationship with her,
- (4) Respondent then hugged and kissed patient, and then patient departed respondent's office with no further therapy being conducted
 - (a) that evening respondent arrived at patient's home with flowers for her and a cassette tape for her daughter,
 - (b) respondent claimed that his purpose in coming to patient's home was to persuade her to continue in therapy with him,
 - (c) respondent further told patient he was in need of love, that she was lonely and in need of love,
 - (d) the following day, respondent sent

flowers to patient with an accompanying card, signed, "Love, T. Brod."

- (5) In February 1986, biofeedback therapy ended and psychotherapy between patient and respondent began. Through and including in or about April 1986, therapy sessions included hugging and kissing. During this period, respondent and patient engaged in:
 - (a) Saturday sightseeing, and
 - (b) meals and tea at patient's residence.
- (6) In or about April 1986 through in or about August 1986, therapy focused on patient's writing.
 - (a) During this period, respondent incorporated certain pictures and a story line which he developed into a profile of patient's therapy entitled The Soul.
 - (b) The Awakening of the Soul was presented by respondent at various professional meetings.
- (7) In or about August 1986, patient was notified of a million dollar inheritance. During her next therapy session, she told respondent of the notification.
- (8) In or about September 1986, patient told respondent that she would need to travel to

Switzerland to take care of matters involving her inheritance. The respondent told patient she would need him to come along; however, for him to accompany her, patient would have to write a letter stating her need to have him along. Respondent told patient he would bring his wife. Patient questioned whether their therapy relation would change, and the respondent replied that he knew what he was doing, and he discounted her worries.

- (9) At the next session, the respondent told patient that he had purchased the tickets. Upon respondent's advice, patient substituted her attorney handling her inheritance for a friend of respondent's.
- (10) Upon arriving in Europe, in September 1986, the respondent, his wife, and patient stayed in a hotel in Zurich, Switzerland. During the first evening, at approximately 12:30 a.m., the respondent came to patient's room.
 - (a) The respondent initially sat with patient on the edge of her bed, then laid next to her.
 - (b) Respondent repeatedly urged patient to engage in sexual intercourse, stating, "Our relationship is almost perfect" and that sex is "your hang-up, not mine." He further

stated that sex would be good for her therapy, and that doing it with someone you love and who loves you in Switzerland where patient had been incestually victimized would be therapeutic.

- (c) Patient questioned whether they could merely continue the relationship without sex; whereupon respondent told her, "It would be too bad if we broke up because of your hangup." Patient thereupon relented, and engaged in sexual intercourse with the respondent.
- (d) In following evenings, while the respondent's wife slept, the respondent and patient engaged in sexual intercourse.
- (11) On or about September 19, 1986, respondent entered patient's hotel bedroom in Amsterdam and asked patient for sexual intercourse. Patient begged respondent not to engage in sexual intercourse that evening, her birthday. He refrained from sexual intercourse that evening.

 (12) Upon their return to California, the respondent presented patient with a bill for the cost of the trip, including souveniers purchased by his wife. Patient paid \$8,000.00 to respondent
- (13) In or about October 1986, during the first week back in therapy, the respondent inquired as

for the trip.

to further payments by patient, whereupon she paid respondent an additional \$1,000.00 in professional fees.

- (a) Respondent then stated he missed patient, and scheduled therapy five times a week as the last appointment of the day. This time was selected so that they could share "loving time."
- (b) Respondent stated that all charges for further therapy sessions would end inasmuch as they had entered into a different kind of relationship.
- (14) From in or about October 1986 through and including in or about April 1989, the respondent and patient met daily at or about 5:00 p.m. for 3 to 3 1/2 hour sessions, which frequently included:
 - (a) fondling,
 - (b) kissing,
 - (c) manual stimulation,
 - (d) sexual intercourse,
 - (e) reading and editing written submissions towards a manuscript drafted by patient.
- (15) During the period between in or about October 1986 through and including in or about April 1989, respondent directed patient to deny their relationship to anyone, and stated that he could lose his license if anyone found out.

(16) In or about March 1989, patient requested that respondent return her manuscript. Respondent refused.

- (17) In or about April 1989, patient told respondent that she intended to end their relationship. Respondent became angry with patient and stated, "You are going to cause trouble. Can't you see what you're doing?" He stated to patient that they could "still be friends." He offered to take patient to lunch for a talk. Patient declined. Respondent told patient that there was no reason their love had to end like this. He then asked patient to remain in his outer waiting room while he typed a letter. She agreed.
 - (a) When the respondent finished with his letter, he joined patient and took her to his car to purportedly take her home.
 - (b) Instead of taking her home, respondent drove patient to a medical facility. When she asked respondent where she was, he responded that she is going where she can't cause trouble and that she would stay until he got her out.
 - (c) As she left the vehicle, she was apprehended by a guard, and restrained with handcuffs. The respondent told the guard

that the patient had tried to kill both herself and the respondent. He stated, "She's dangerous." He gave the guard a letter and directed that she be held and transported to a county facility pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 5150.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 14. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under sections 2234 and 2263 of the Code for unprofessional conduct in the willful and unauthorized violation of professional confidence. The facts and circumstances are as follows:
 - A. Complainant incorporates by reference paragraph
 13 as though fully set, forth herein.
 - B. Respondent revealed to patient certain confidences concerning:
 - Patient K.P.
 - (a) That patient K.P. saw respondent for biofeedback and psychotherapy.
 - (b) That patient K.P.'s husband was a musician.
 - (c) That patient K.P. and respondent had entered into a commercial transaction involving a harp.
 - Patient C.R.
 - (a) That patient C.R. saw respondent for psychotherapy.
 - (b) That patient C.R. was employed as a

writer for the Los Angeles Weekly.

(c) That patient C.R. had studied

1

26

negligence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. <u>Factual Allegations</u>

27

(1) Complainant incorporates by reference

The facts and circumstances are as follows:

has committed and attempted to commit several acts of gross

paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 as though fully set forth herein.

B. <u>Allegations of Negligent Treatment</u>

- (1) Respondent failed to avoid a substantial and personal relationship with patient V.T., which included travel under the guise of therapy.
- (2) Respondent failed to avoid a sexual relationship with patient V.T. under the guise of therapy.
- (3) Respondent failed to properly utilize psychotherapeutic sessions with patient V.T.
- (4) Respondent inappropriately directed patient V.T. to draft a letter justifying respondent's travel to Europe with patient V.T.
- (5) Respondent failed to maintain honest, and forthright dealings with patient V.T.
- (6) Respondent entered into a dual relationship with patient V.T. by entering into, maintaining, and supervising a financial relationship with her.
- (7) Respondent engaged in the exploitation of patient V.T. by encouraging, entering into, and maintaining a financial or commercial relationship with her.
- (8) Respondent failed to maintain a clear and objective perspective in conducting psychtherapy with patient V.T. when he entered into and maintained or supervised a financial or commercial

relationship with her.

- (9) Respondent entered into a conflict of interest with patient V.T. by entering into, maintaining or supervising a financial or commercial relationship with her.
- (10) Respondent compromised patient's ability for free and informed consent by entering into and supervising a financial or commercial relationship with patient V.T.
- (11) Respondent failed to return material furnished by patient V.T. on demand.
- (12) Respondent hospitalized patient V.T. in a psychiatric facility without medical indication therefore.
- (13) Respondent failed to maintain clinical notes incident to treatment sessions with patient V.T.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

- 17. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(c) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that he committed and attempted to commit repeated acts of negligence.

 The facts and circumstances are as follows:
 - A. Complainant incorporates by reference paragraph
 16 as though fully set forth herein.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

18. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234(d) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that he committed and attempted to commit incompetence. The facts and

Complainant incorporates by reference paragraph 2 Α. 16 as though fully set forth herein. 3 4 SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under 5 section 2234(e) of the Code for unprofessional conduct in that he 6 committed and attempted to commit acts involving dishonesty or 7 corruption substantially related to the qualifications, 8 functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon. The facts and 9 circumstances are as follows: 10 Complainant incorporates by reference paragraph 11 16 as though fully set forth herein. 12 13 PRAYER WHEREFORE, Complainant prays a hearing be held on the 14 matters alleged herein, and, following said hearing, the Division 15 issue a decision: 16 Revoking or suspending Physician & Surgeon . 17 Certificate No. G-20595, heretofore issued to 18 Thomas M. Brod, M.D.; and 19 Taking such other and further action as the 20 21 Division may deem proper. 22 DATED: September 15, 1993. 23 DIXON ARNETT 24 Executive Director Medical Board of California 25 Complainant 26

circumstances are as follows: